



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/413,923	10/07/1999	P. BRUCE NEWELL	98-1-3111P	2610

7590 03/13/2003

WILLIAM H MCNEILL
OSRAM SYLVANIA INC
100 ENDICOTT STREET
DANVERS, MA 01923

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, JOSEPH L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2879

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/413,923

Applicant(s)

NEWELL ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph L. Williams

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3 and 5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3 and 5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

The finality of the last Office Action has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dakin et al. (US 4,757,236), of record, in view of Ramaiah et al. (US 4,866,342).
3. Regarding claims 1 and 3, Fig. 1 as well the Abstract, col. 2, lines 34-54 and col. 3, line 37-col. 4, line 58 of Dakin et al. disclose a mercury-free, metal halide lamp having a pinch seal at each end (See Fig. 1) that comprises the following: an outer envelope (11) that contains an atmosphere selected from the group consisting of vacuum and nitrogen; and an arc discharge vessel (10) mounted therein; wherein, the vessel has an aspect ratio greater than 5 and containing a fill comprised of iodides selected from the group consisting of sodium, scandium, lithium or cesium and a buffer gas of from about 50 torr to 500 torr selected from the group consisting of xenon, argon and krypton. More over, Dakin et al. disclose the discharge vessel inherently comprised of fused silica (See col. 2, lines 43-47) since Dakin et al. discloses the arc tube being comprised of fused quartz, wherein quartz comprises silica.

Art Unit: 2879

4. Yet, Dakin et al. discloses the use of end caps to seal the lamp, and does not specifically discuss metal halide lamp having pinch seals at each end.
5. However, metal halide lamps with fused silica envelopes having both ends that are pinch sealed for the purpose of sealing the lamp are of common knowledge in the art as evidenced by column 3, lines 20-25 of Ramaiah et al. ('342).
6. Since the applicants' disclosure has failed to show that pinch sealing both ends of a metal halide lamp as opposed to using end caps to seal the lamp produces unobvious results or solves a stated problem that is outside the scope of the prior art, pinch sealing both ends of a metal halide lamp as opposed to incorporating end caps is deemed a choice in design.
7. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to alternatively have both ends of the metal halide lamp of Dakin et al. pinch sealed as shown by Ramaiah et al. for the purpose of sealing the lamp.
8. With regards to claim 5, the lamp of Dakin et al. inherently comprises a ballast that is capable of supplying power in order for the lamp to operate. Note- In claim 5, Applicants are incorrectly trying to invoke 112-6t" paragraph (means plus function), as a result, patentable weight is given to the structure (lamp having a ballast) and not to the functional or intended use limitations.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, and 5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
10. Applicant's arguments filed 26 August 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
11. The Applicant argues that Dakin ('236) does not teach the use of a metal halide lamp. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and points to the abstract of Dakin, which discloses the use of sodium iodide in the lamp, which is a metal halide.
12. The Applicant argues that Dakin ('236) does not teach the use of a fill selected from sodium, scandium, or lithium. The Examiner respectfully disagrees and points to column 1, line 68 of Dakin, which discloses a fill comprised of sodium.
13. The Applicant argues that the prior art of record does not show metal halide arc lamps containing more than two halides. However, the Applicant has not claimed this limitation, and therefore the argument is moot.
14. The Applicant argues regarding claim 5 that the prior art does not disclose a ballast supplying between 250 and 400 watts to operate the lamp. However, that limitation is an intended use statement and is thus not afforded patentable weight.

Art Unit: 2879

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph L. Williams whose telephone number is (703) 305-1670. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30 AM-3:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (703) 305-4794. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7382 for regular communications and (703) 308-7382 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Joseph Williams
Examiner
Art Unit 2879
March 10, 2003